REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 19, 2004, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-9, 13, 20-22, 25, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,012,068 (Boezeman); claims 15-19, 23-26, and 34-38 were rejected under § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,454 (Hobbs); and claims 3, 6, 10-12, and 14 were rejected under § 103 over Boezeman in view of Hobbs.

Claims 12, 15, 16, and 33 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Boezeman. One of the elements of a system according to claim 1 is that the controller is able to map plural data types defined by a database system to corresponding file types to enable presentation in the client system of an object having an associated data type retrieved from the database system. Claim 1 also recites that the controller maps the plural data types to the corresponding file types based on a table having multiple entries each associating a data type defined by the database system with a file extension corresponding to a respective file type.

No such mapping based on a table, as recited in claim 1, is disclosed by Boezeman. In Boezeman, determination of a media type is based on the extension of the file name. Thus, a "WAV" extension or an "AU" extension in a file name indicates that the media type is an audio media type. In Boezeman, determination of the media type of a file is based on the extension that already exists in the file name. Therefore, there is no need for a table in Boezeman that contains multiple entries each associating a data type defined by the database system with a file extension associated with a corresponding file type, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Boezeman.

Claims dependent from claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, with respect to claim 2 (which depends from claim 1), Boezeman does not disclose that the controller comprises a network communications service to receive the request from the client system. Note that the request referenced in claim 2 is the request from the client system for information in a database system.

In Boezeman, a computer 15 (Figures 1 and 2 of Boezeman) that provides "transparent access to media files of a plurality of types stored at various locations

including locally, on server 30 or on server 40." Boezeman, 7:46-48. Thus, the tasks performed by the media manager of Figures 3-6 are performed in the computer system 15. As best seen in Figure 1 of Boezeman, any request that is sent is generated locally in the computer system 15, with the request sent *out* through a communications interface 27. Thus, the computer system 15 does *not* receive a request from a client system through a network communication service. Rather, the request is generated locally.

Independent claim 20 is allowable over Boezeman for similar reasons as for claim 1.

Claims dependent from claim 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, with respect to claims 23-25, it is respectfully noted that such claims were improperly rejected as being anticipated by Hobbs. Note that claims 23-25 all depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 20, which was rejected as being anticipated by Boezeman.

Claim 30 has been amended from dependent form to independent form, with the scope of the claim unchanged. Boezeman does not teach that the controller is adapted to communicate the requested information *and executable code* associated with the requested information to the client system, where the executable code is *for presenting the requested information* in the client system. Information retrieved from the server 30 or 40 of Boezeman includes only the media file itself, *not the executable code* associated with the media file that is for presenting the media file in the client system.

Independent claim 36 (amended from dependent form to independent form with the scope unchanged) is allowable for similar reasons as claim 30.

Claim 17 has been amended from dependent form to independent form. Claim 17 was rejected as being anticipated by Hobbs. Claim 17 recites, *inter alia*, mapping plural data types stored in the object relational database with corresponding plural file types. The Office Action cited column 16, lines 34-59, and column 17, lines 1-11 and 23-48, as teaching this element. The cited passages describe the proxy server 207 using a key in a table lookup to match the key with one of a plurality of expert-predetermined optimum values used to retrieve records from a database. Hobbs, 16:34-59. The cited passages also describe the content of a request (Hobbs, 17:1-11) and authentication performed by the database server to enable searching for records (Hobbs, 17:23-32). The cited

passages also describe showing the content of a document from a document server, which contains hyperlinked symbols to indicate properties of linked media (Hobbs, 17:33-48). However, no mention is made in these passages, or anywhere else in Hobbs, of the recited mapping of claim 17. Therefore, claim 17 is not anticipated by Hobbs.

Claims dependent from claim 17 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Moreover, with respect to claim 18, Hobbs does not teach that associating the object with one of plural presentation routines is based on the file type of the object. Although the cited passages of Hobbs refer to displaying HTML files in a browser, there is no teaching in the cited passages of Hobbs of associating the object with one of plural presentation routines based on the file type of the object.

Independent claim 26 is also not anticipated by Hobbs. Claim 26 recites that an applet contains instructions that when executed provide an interactive portion of a browser screen to enable *user entry of Structured Query Language (SQL) queries*, and the applet is responsive to SQL queries *entered in the interactive portion of the browser screen* by sending corresponding requests for accessing data in a database system. The only mention of SQL made in Hobbs is in column 10, lines 63-66. In this passage, Hobbs states that the proxy server instead of using CGI can use embedded SQL commands to pass the query argument directly to the data warehouse. However, the remaining passage cited by the Office Action does not refer to entry of SQL queries into an interactive portion of a browser screen. Although Hobbs states that the embedded application executing on the browser causes a plurality of buttons corresponding to a plurality of arguments for selecting a plurality of databases to appear in one of the frames of the browser window (Hobbs, 22:1-9), there is absolutely no indication whatsoever that any of the frames of the browser window can be used for user entry of SQL queries. Therefore, claim 26 is clearly not anticipated by Hobbs.

Claims dependent from claim 26 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, all claims are in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1673 (9170).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-19-04

Dan C. Hu, Reg. No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
Telephone: (713) 468-8880, ext. 304
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883